- A3875-1F 3/86 -

A SURVEY OF:

TENANT CHARACTERISTICS AND ADMISSION AND ASSIGNMENT POLICIES AT THE NATION'S LARGE HOUSING AUTHORITIES

Public Housing Research Project

Citizens Housing and Planning Association
7 Marshall Street Boston, MA 02108
(617) 742-0820

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In May 1984, Citizens Housing and Planning Association distributed a survey on tenant characteristics and admission and assignment policies to the nation's 133 largest housing authorities (those managing over 1250 units). Sixty-four PHAs or 48 percent of the authorities responded and responses were received from authorities in every region of the country. In total, the responding authorities manage 477,355 units or approximately 40 percent of the nation's public housing stock. Because each of the authorities surveyed manages 1250 or more units, the results of the survey reflect the characteristics of large, primarily urban, housing authorities and not necessarily those of the nation's entire public housing stock.

The survey found the following:

- More than three-quarters of family public housing units surveyed are occupied by minorities and this percentage is likely to increase in the future. A large number of authorities have tenant populations which are almost exclusively black. At one-quarter of the authorities black families currently occupy 90 percent of the units, while one-third of the PHAs surveyed have waiting lists on which 90 percent or more of the families are black.

- A majority of the families at large housing authorities are headed by women. Seventy percent of the households surveyed have a female head if the New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) is not included and 53 percent if it is.

- Most public housing families are headed by an unemployed person. Only 25.5 percent of the heads of household are employed without the NYCHA units and 35.5 percent if New York is included. Only 4 percent of the authorities reported having 50 percent or more households employed. This means that almost three-quarters of the families are not supported by a working member.

- Approximately 36 percent of the families received AFDC benefits, if New York is included and 44 percent if it is not.

- The demand for family units is twice as great as that for elderly units and the greatest demand is for two-bedroom units.

- The waiting list for family public housing is largely minority. More than three-quarters of the authorities have waiting lists on which 75 percent or more of the family applicants are minorities. Blacks families comprise the largest portion of minorities on the waiting list (64.40 percent of the total with NYCHA, 68.64 percent without it and 77.37 percent of those on waiting list).

- Over one-third of those surveyed reported that they did no marketing of units or outreach activities, citing lengthy waiting lists and an interest in serving those most in need. Twenty percent said that their efforts are targeted exclusively at the elderly.

- Sixty-four percent of the authorities allow applicants to make three refusals on units offered before altering their position on the waiting list.

INTRODUCTION

Sample Size

The authorities that responded manage 477,355 units or approximately 40 percent of the nation's conventional public housing stock. Fifteen of the authorities manage over 5000 units.(See map on page 8.)

Region	# of PHAs	# of Units
Northeast	10	222,075*
South	24	131,445
North Central	13	62,499
Southwest	10	42,009
Northwest	5	19,327

* The New York City Housing Authority owns and manages 172,006 of these units.

Seventy-eight percent of the units (374,152) in the survey are family units, while 22 percent (103,203) are elderly units. In order to encourage the authorities to respond as openly as possible, we have agreed not to identify them. However, because the New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) manages almost one-third of the units in the survey, it has agreed to be identified so that the impact of its units on the results can be clearly displayed. Because some of the authorities were not able to provide answers to all of the questions, we have cited the actual sample size (N) for questions where the results reflect less than the full sample.

Each of the nation's 133 largest housing authorities was asked to complete a questionnaire. Because of the large number of responses and the geographical distribution of the responding authorities, we believe that the results provide reasonably accurate and extremely important information on the characteristics of the tenant populations and the admission and assignment policies of the nation's largest authorities. (See Page 6 for a description of the regional distribution of the responding PHAs.)

Most of the questions on the survey and the survey results focus on the characteristics of the families rather than the elderly population in public housing. The data analysis is presented in the following six sections:

1. Race and Ethnicity in Family Public Housing
2. Family Composition
3. Employment and Source of Income
4. Demand for Public Housing Units
5. Marketing and Outreach Activities
6. Admission and Assignment Policies and Procedures

1. RACE AND ETHNICITY IN FAMILY PUBLIC HOUSING

It is clear from the results of the survey that large public housing authorities provide shelter for a predominantly minority population in their family housing and that the percent of public housing units occupied by minorities will continue to grow. Of the family units surveyed only 14 percent are occupied by white families (not including hispanics) if New York's units are included or nearly 19 percent if they are not. If the survey results are limited to those PHAs managing over 5000 units, the percent of units occupied by minorities increases from 85.90 to 92.80 percent.

Blacks constitute the predominant racial group in family public housing. Currently, they occupy 64.40 percent of the units sampled if New York is included and 68.64 percent if it is not. Hispanic families occupy 17.90 percent of units with New York but only 7.60 percent without it. Asians and others occupy only a very small percent of the total number of units: less than 4 percent in total and less than 3 percent each.

Exhibit 1

Racial and Ethnic Origin of Families in Public Housing

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Other
Current	14.10	64.40	17.74	2.16	1.79
Current without NYCHA	18.79	68.64	8.31	1.88	1.99
Waiting list	11.34	77.37	6.47	2.43	1.80

(N= 59 PHAs: 348,185 units with New York, 195,055 without New York)

Note: Due to rounding errors columns may not add up to 100 percent.

Fully one-quarter (26 percent) of the authorities surveyed have tenant populations in which 90 percent or more units are occupied by blacks; almost 65 percent said that at least 50 percent of their units are occupied by black families. Of the 15 PHAs where 90 percent or more units are occupied by blacks, ten are over 95 percent black. Most of these are located in the south.

Exhibit 2

PHAs in Which the Current Tenant Population Comprises:	Percent
90% or more black families	25.80
75% or more black families	41.37
50% or more black families	65.50

Exhibit 3

PHAs in Which the Waiting List Comprises:	Percent
90% or more black families	30.00
75% or more black families	50.00
50% or more black families	71.69

Waiting List Population

Assuming that existing policies concerning admission remain largely unchanged, the waiting list population provides one indicator of who will be in public housing in the future. New York City is not included in the waiting list analysis.

The percent of white families on the waiting list for public housing is approximately 7 percent below that in the current population: 11.34 v. 18.79 percent. This means that the percent of minority families is 7 percent larger in the waiting list population than it is currently. Although the data from many of the authorities show that the percent of hispanics in individual PHAs' tenant population is likely to increase, the data also shows that overall they are likely to occupy a slightly smaller percent of the total units in the future. The differences between the proportion of Asians and others in the current and the waiting list population is nominal.

Regional Variations in the Racial/Ethnic Composition of Families in Public Housing

In order to understand whether the racial and ethnic composition of families currently living in public housing and on the waiting list varies from region to region, we have grouped the responding authorities into five regions: Northeast, North Central, Northwest, South and Southwest. The sample sizes for the regions range from a high of 24 authorities and 97,481 units in the south to a low of 5 authorities and 6805 units in the Northwest. The New York City Housing Authority has not been included in the regional analysis. In Exhibit 4 below, the number of authorities in each region managing over 5000 units is shown in parentheses next to the number of PHAs in the region.

Exhibit 4

Regional Sample Of Family Public Housing Units

Region	# of PHAs in Region	# of Family Units
Northeast *	14 (2)	45,934
North Central	9 (2)	18,812
Northwest	5 (1)	6,805
South	24 (7)	97,481
Southwest	11 (2)	25,264

(* Does not include NYCHA. If NYCHA is included sample size = 15 PHAs and 199,064 units.)

(N) = Number of PHAs in each region managing over 5000 units of housing.

The results of the analysis displayed in Exhibits 5 and 6 clearly show significant variations between regions in racial and ethnic composition as well as significant regional variations from the national trends. For example, although the national sample shows that white families currently occupy 14.10 percent of the units in the sample and comprise 11.34 percent of the families on the waiting list, white families in the South comprise only 8.46 percent of the current families and only 6.2 percent of those of the waiting list. In the Northwest, however, the percent of white families is not only much greater than it is in the South or nationwide but, it is greater on the waiting list than in the current population. This indicates that the percent of whites in the Northwest is likely to increase rather than decrease in the future. White families currently occupy 32.84 percent of the units, while they comprise 43.15 percent of the families on the waiting list. The percent of hispanic families varies dramatically across regions; in the North Central region they occupy only one percent of the units, while in the Southwest, they occupy 37.20 percent of the units. Variations in the waiting list populations are equally significant. For example, Asians comprise only .23 percent of the families on the waiting lists in the South while comprise 18.50 percent of the families on the waiting lists in the Southwest.

Regional Location of Housing Authorities in the Sample

Exhibit 5

Current Tenant Population in Family Public Housing

	Northeast*	North Central	Northwest	South	Southwest
White	31.40	18.00	32.84	8.46	14.95
Black	57.12	71.60	25.96	89.50	1.35
Hispanic	8.20	1.00	24.00	1.35	37.20
Asian	2.50	6.43	11.51	.05	4.96
Other	.19	3.41	5.39	.64	10.00

Exhibit 6

Waiting List Population

	Northeast*	North Central	Northwest	South	Southwest
White	15.86	24.35	43.15	6.62	20.00
Black	70.13	67.65	34.20	88.83	28.37
Hispanic	11.57	1.35	2.56	4.09	15.77
Asian	2.68	5.54	16.40	.23	18.50
Other	.42	2.00	3.60	.20	16.93

* Does not include NYCHA

Note: Due to rounding error, the columns may not add up to 100 percent.

2. FAMILY COMPOSITION

Of the units surveyed, 64 percent are currently occupied by female-headed households if New York City is included and 79 percent if it is not. Eighty-five percent of the authorities which responded reported that at least 50 percent of their family units are occupied by families with a female head, while 20 percent reported that 90 percent or more of their units are occupied by families headed by females.

(Few authorities maintain information on the characteristics of families on their waiting lists, therefore, it is impossible to develop an accurate estimate of the number of female-headed households on the waiting list for public housing.)

Exhibit 7

Female-headed Households in Public Housing

PHAs in which:	Number	Percent
90% or more households are female-headed	11	22.0
75% or more households are female headed	25	50.0
50% or more households are female-headed	42	84.0

Exhibit 8

Percent of Family Units Occupied by Female-headed Households

If NYCHA is included (N= 50 PHAs; 303,695 units)	53.6
If NYCHA is not included (N= 49 PHAs; 150,565)	69.47
Percent of all units occupied by female- headed households in PHAs managing over 5000 units (N= 16 PHAs; 220,327 units)	45.7

3. EMPLOYMENT AND SOURCE OF INCOME

Employment

The survey showed that among the responding authorities, 35.50 percent of the household heads are employed if the NYCHA is included, while only 25.50 percent are employed if New York is not included. This means that almost three-quarters of public housing families are not supported by a working member. Only 4.0 percent of the authorities surveyed had 50 percent or more employed households, while slightly more than one-half reported that between one-quarter and one-half of their households were headed by an employed person. The median average income of working families at the authorities surveyed was $7,908.00.

Exhibit 9

Employment of Public Housing Residents

(N=47 PHAs)

PHAs at which:	Number	Percent
50 percent or more heads of households are employed	2	4.00
Between 25 and 49 percent percent of heads of household are employed	26	55.30
Less than 25 percent of heads of household are employed are employed	18	38.30

Exhibit 10

Percent of All Heads Employed

(N=329,394 units)

If NYCHA is included (N=329,394)	35.50
If NYCHA is not included (N= 176,264)	25.50

Source of Income

The survey showed that if the New York City Housing Authority is not included, 44 percent of all public housing families receive AFDC payments. If New York City is included, the percent drops to approximately 36. Looking only at extra-large authorities (those managing over 5000 units) but eliminating New York, one-half of all the families receive AFDC payments. Although a substantial portion of the residents at the authorities surveyed receive AFDC benefits, the survey data is not adequate to calculate the average level of dependence, the average length of time the residents have received assistance, the proportion of recipients who are employed, or the number of recipients who remain at home to care for children under six years of age. Each of these factors would be important in analyzing the impact of AFDC as a tenant characteristic variable.

Exhibit 11

Source of Income

(N= 51 PHAs)

PHAs with:	Number	Percent
75% or more families on AFDC	4	7.8
50% or more families on AFDC	18	35.3
Between 25% and 50% of families on AFDC	29	56.8

Exhibit 12

Percent of All Public Housing Families on AFDC

(N=321,961 units with NYCHA, 168,831 units without NYCHA)

Including NYCHA	36.4
Not including New York	44.0

4. DEMAND FOR PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS

The number of families on the waiting list for public housing is one indicator of the demand for public housing units. However, for a number of reasons, it is not an extremely precise indicator. Perhaps most importantly, many families are discouraged from applying in communities where waiting lists are extremely long. It is also not clear whether certain sizes or kinds of families are more easily discouraged and, if so, how this influences the current demand as evidenced by the waiting list. HUD regulations also permit authorities to close their lists if it is obvious that a family would not be offered shelter during a reasonable length of time. For all of the above reasons, demand may be significantly underestimated by the waiting list.

Although the demand for public housing units varies greatly from authority to authority, there is clearly a significant demand nationwide for units, especially family units. In fact, the demand for family units is almost twice that for elderly units.

	Available Units	# of Families on Waiting List
Family	374,152	247,563
Elderly	103,203	32,555

In the figures below, the demand is expressed using the following ratio: $\frac{\text{number of families on the waiting list}}{\text{number of available units}}$
The higher the number, the greater the demand. For example, if an authority has 2000 units and a waiting list of 400 families, its demand ratio is .20. An authority with an equal number of units but a waiting list of 1000 households would have a demand ratio of .50.

$$\frac{400}{2000} = .20 \qquad \frac{1000}{2000} = .50$$

It is possible to calculate a demand ratio for all the authorities in the survey, for an individual PHA or for a particular size of unit. If the demand ratios of all the surveyed authorities are placed in order from the lowest to the highest and there are sixty-four authorities, the median demand ratio would be that of the 32th PHA. The mean or average ratio is arrived at by adding the demand ratios for all the authorities and dividing by the number of authorities. The range is the distance between the highest and the lowest demand ratios.

Exhibit 12

Demand for Family and Elderly Public Housing Units

Demand for Family Units	.66
Median demand ratio	.49
Mean demand ratio	.68
Range	.05 to 4.65
Demand for Elderly Units	.31
Median demand ratio	.29
Mean demand ratio	.40
Range	0.00 to 2.31

Of particular interest is the type of units for which demand is greatest. Although the federal government has recently stressed the construction of large family units, the survey results show that of two-, three-, and four-bedroom units, demand is greatest at the authorities surveyed-- at least as evidenced by the waiting list-- for two-bedroom apartments. Again, demand is expressed as a ratio of the number of families waiting for a unit of a particular size to the number of units of that size available.

For example, if an authority has 100 two-bedroom units and 70 families on the waiting list for two-bedroom units, then the demand for these units equals .70. (70/100 = .70) However, if it has 100 three-bedroom units but only 54 families on the waiting list, the demand ratio for these units is only .54. (54/100 = .54) Listed below are the aggregate demand ratios for all the two-, three- and four-bedroom units in the survey. The demand for different sized units varies greatly from authority to authority.

Exhibit 13

Future Demand for Units

	2 Br.	3 Br.	4 Br.
With NYCHA	.70	.51	.39
Without NYCHA	.78	.67	.46

Turnover rates for family units range from a low of .01 a year to a high of .29 a year. An authority with 100 units and a turnover rate of .29 will have approximately 29 units available annually for new occupants. Of the authorities surveyed, the median rate is .11 and the mean is .12. This means that most authorities will have between 11 and 12 percent of their units become available each year.

The percent of the local population which is eligible for public housing and the percent of the eligible families which is served varies greatly from community to community. Of the authorities surveyed, the percent of local families eligible for public housing ranges from a low of 20 percent to a high of 48 percent. The percent actually served ranges from .3 percent to 10 percent--figures which demonstrate the vastly different role that public housing plays from community to community.

5. MARKETING AND OUTREACH ACTIVITIES

The efforts on the part of authorities to attract tenants to public housing vary greatly depending on a number of factors: the length of an authority's waiting list; whether or not there are certain types of applicants on the waiting list (i.e those in different income and/or racial and ethnic groups); the local housing market; and an authority's occupancy objectives. For example, an authority may be particularly interested in bringing more higher-income tenants into its projects. Although it has a lengthy waiting list, the authority may make a particular effort to attract higher-income tenants if it has few such families on the waiting list. The extent and sophistication of these efforts varies widely from placing simple ads in the local newspaper to hiring public relations firms to market units to particular segments of the eligible population.

Over one-third of the authorities surveyed (36.4 percent) said that they did no marketing or outreach, citing lengthy waiting lists and an interest in serving those most in need. Almost one-quarter (22 percent) reported that they used a variety of techniques including newspaper ads, talking to community groups and social service agencies and, in a few instances, hiring a public relations firm. Twenty percent said that their efforts were targeted exclusively at the elderly due to decreased demand for elderly units. Thirteen percent said that their efforts focused on encouraging white tenants to apply in order to meet integration objectives.

6. ADMISSION AND ASSIGNMENT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

The survey asked a number of questions about the authorities' admission and assignment policies. Almost three-quarters (71 percent) of respondents reported that their board of commissioners was responsible for setting the authorities' tenant selection priorities and assignment policies. Only three percent said that it was solely the responsibility of the executive director, while 2 percent said that it was the board and the director together who establish priorties and policies. Eighteen percent stated that policies and priorities were established by the board, the executive director and the staff working together. However, in the establishment of strategies and procedures for selection and assignment, the staff and the executive director play a much greater role. Only 46 percent of authorities said that the board participated, while at 58 percent of PHAs, the executive director was involved. At 48 percent, the staff was part of the process, while only 1.7 percent said that tenants are involved in the process.

The authorities were asked what objectives they set for tenant selection. They were given a choice of four different objectives traditionally associated with the public housing program and were permitted to add others to the list. They could select either one or several of the objectives and were not asked to rank order them. The responses clearly show that many authorities maintain objectives which, if not exactly conflicting, may be difficult to achieve simultaneously. For example, almost 90 percent said that "maintaining an economic mix" was a priority, while 41 percent said that they were concerned with "serving those with the greatest need." Only 22 percent said that providing temporary assistance to families in emergency situations was a priority, while 67 percent said that maintaining a racial mix was an important objective.

The authorities were also asked about the objectives on which their assignment policies are based. They were given several choices and were also permitted to add other responses. While 91 percent of the PHAs said that maintaining an economic mix was a selection priority only 30 percent said that achieving an economic mix was important in assigning tenants to developments. Economic mixing, however, is essentially ineffective unless it done is at the project level. Follow-up phone calls to a number of the authorities which cited economic mixing as an assignment objective revealed

several things. (1) Although it is an objective for many authorities, a lack of higher-income tenants on the waiting list makes it a difficult, if not impossible, objective to achieve. (2) Some authorities feel strongly that applicants should be taken as much as possible in the order in which they applied, thereby also making income mixing difficult. (3) It appears that authorities with both the policies and adequate applicants to achieve income mixing represent a small number of large housing authorities which responded to the survey.

Approximately 58 percent of authorities said that achieving a racial balance is an assignment objective. Forty-six percent stated that they used assignment policies as a method of achieving an appropriate project density. Only six percent said that giving applicants the project of their choice was an objective for assigning tenants. In general, these authorities tended to be county PHAs with projects spread over a wide area.

Exhibit 14

Tenant Selection and Assignment Policies

Objectives for Tenant Selection Priorities		Objectives for Tenant Assignment Policies	
Economic Mix	91.6%	Appropriate project density	46.2%
Racial Mix	75.0	Racial Balance	57.7
Temporary Assistance	22.0	Economic Mix	28.8
Serving those with the greatest need	44.0	Locational Choice	5.8

Applicant Screening Process

Housing authorities were given a list of different types of information and were asked whether or not this data was collected from applicants during the application process. The list included the following:

- Family size
- Age of members
- Race of family
- Income
- Source of income
- Current housing status
- Medical information which could affect the need for housing
- Disabled or handicapped status
- Veteran status
- Whether or not applicant previously lived in public housing
- Past criminal activity
- Other

Forty-five percent of the authorities said that they collected all of the data. Thirty-eight percent said that they collected everything except information on past criminal activity. Eighteen percent reported collecting data on all of the above except on medical conditions, while 12 percent did not collect information on veteran's status. Among the other types of information which authorities said that they collected were: prior housing history (10 percent); landlord references (13 percent); information on assets (10 percent); eviction history (3 percent); amount of rent currently being paid (3 percent); and conviction records (3 percent). Because authorities were not asked to check only those types of information collected for all applicants, it is not clear with what frequency this data is collected.

Authorities were also asked to choose from a list of possible methods for verifying the above information. The following chart displays the percent of authorities which reported using each of the methods of verification. Again, the list should not be interpreted to mean that the authorities use these methods for verifying information on every applicant.

Exhibit 15

Verification of Application Data

Method of Verification	Percent
Credit check	32.2
Police records	41.9
W2 form	43.5
Military records	53.3

Marriage records	74.1
Employer references	75.0
Birth records	83.8
Previous rent paying history	85.4
Home visit	87.0
Public assistance records	96.7
Other (included: medical records, pay check stubs, proof of child care expenses.)	

The authorities were also asked what items they considered in reviewing applicants according to non-economic criteria. The responses are displayed below:

Items considered	Percent
Housekeeping patterns	88.3
Employment stability	37.3
Family stability	39.0
Social behavior	86.1

Waiting List Procedures

Eighty-six percent of the large authorities maintain a centralized waiting list, while 8 percent keep theirs on a project basis. Six percent maintain both a centralized and a project list.

The authorities were asked how the applications were sorted on the waiting list other than by unit size and the date of application. Sixty-six percent reported that the applications were sorted by income level, while 37 percent cited a variety of other categories including: race, veteran status, handicapped and displaced person status and according to special needs.

The majority of authorities use a three-tier offer system in assigning tenants. Sixty-three percent of the PHAs allow applicants to make three refusals before their position on the waiting list is altered. Twenty-two percent allow two refusals, 10 percent allow only one, and 1.7 percent permit an applicant to refuse 4 units before dropping to the bottom or being removed for a certain period of time from the waiting list.

Appendix

Survey Instrument

I. PHA Admissions and Assignment: Policies and Strategies

A. Who or what has the responsibility for setting the authority's tenant selection priorities and assignment policies:

_____Board of Commissioners
_____Executive Director
_____PHA Staff
_____Tenants
_____Local Community
_____HUD
_____Court Decisions
_____Other

B. Who or what has the responsibility for setting the tenant selection priorities and assignment strategies and procedures:

_____Board of Commissioners
_____Executive Director
_____PHA Staff
_____Tenants
_____Local Community
_____HUD
_____Court Decisions
_____Other

C. Are these policies and/or strategies in written form:

_____Yes (Please enclose)

_____No

D. What are the objectives the PHA has set for its tenant selection priorities (Check all that apply):

_____Maintain an economic mix
_____Maintain a racial mix
_____Provide temporary assistance to families in emergency situations
_____To serve those with the greatest need
_____Other; explain _____

_____

_____

E. What are the objectives the PHA has set for its assignment policies:

_____To achieve an appropriate project density level
_____To achieve a racial balance
_____Other, explain _____

_____

_____

F. Are there marketing and outreach programs the PHA uses to attract applicants to meet its selection priority and/or assignment strategies:

_____Yes; please describe briefly and enclose program information and/or promotional documents, if available _____

_____

_____

_____No; how does the PHA generally solicit applicants for public housing _____

_____

G. Have these programs been successful?

_____Yes; please briefly describe the results of any marketing and outreach efforts _____

_____

_____

_____No; please explain _____

_____

_____

II. Applicant Screening Process

A. What data is collected from applicants during the applicant screening procedure:

_____family size
_____age of members
_____race of family
_____income
_____source of income
_____current housing status
_____medical information which could affect the need for housing
_____whether the applicant is disabled or handicapped
_____employment status
_____veteran status
_____whether applicant has been housed in public housing prior to application
_____past criminal activity
_____other; please explain _____

_____

B. What methods are used to verify information about applicants:

_____previous rent paying record
_____military records
_____public assistance verification
_____marriage records
_____birth records
_____police records
_____credit check
_____home visit
_____employer references
_____W2 form
_____other; please explain _____

_____

_____

C. What items are considered in reviewing applicants for acceptability according to non-economic criteria:

_____housekeeping patterns
_____employment stability
_____family stability
_____social behavior
_____vandalism
_____criminal activity
_____drug or alcohol abuse
_____landlord check
_____other; please explain _____

_____

D. What are the procedures for notifying tenants of outcome of review:

_____waiting list entry notice
_____rejection notice
_____other; please explain _____

_____

_____

E. Are reasons for rejecting applicants given:

_____Yes. If yes, are the reasons given in writing or are they verbally transmitted _____

_____

_____No

F. Is there an appeals process for rejected applicants:

_____Yes. If yes, please describe _____

_____

_____

_____No

G. Are tenants involved in the applicant screening process:

_____Yes. If yes, please describe _____

_____

_____

_____No

III. Waiting List Procedures

A. Is the waiting list:

_____centralized
_____project-based

B. How are applicants sorted on the list other than by date of application?

_____size of unit required
_____preferred project
_____income level
_____other; please explain _____

_____

_____

C. How are applicants notified of their position on the waiting list?

_____PHA notifies applicant
_____applicant requests PHA

D. What is the process of updating the waiting list; e.g., are applicants notified by mail or telephone, how many attempts are made, who has the responsibility? _____

_____

_____

E. Does an applicant have the right to refuse a unit offered by the authority?

_____Yes. If yes, how many times? _____

_____No

Is his/her position on the waiting list altered if a unit is refused?

_____Yes
_____No

If a unit is refused more than once?

_____Yes
_____No

Remarks: _____

_____

_____

IV. Waiting List Analysis

A. Total number of conventional public housing units:

_____family

_____elderly

B. Total number of conventional public housing units broken down by size:

_____Efficiencies

_____1 Bedroom

_____2 Bedroom

_____3 Bedroom

_____4 or more bedrooms

C. Total number of applicants on waiting list:

_____family

_____elderly

D. Total number of applicants for:

_____Efficiencies

_____1 BR

_____2 BR

_____3 BR

_____4 BR or more

E. Yearly average turnover rate for:

_____family units

_____elderly units

F. Please describe the applicants on the waiting list for family housing:

Racial composition:

_____ % white

_____ % black

_____ % hispanic

_____% Asian

_____% American Indian

_____% other

_____number of working families

_____average income of working families

_____number of families on AFDC

_____number of single-headed households

_____average income of all families

G. Please describe the community at large that you serve in terms of:

Racial composition:

_____% white _____% Asian

_____% black _____% American Indian

_____% hispanic _____% Other

_____average family income

_____% of families in community living in conventional public housing

_____estimated % of families in community eligible to live in conventional public housing

V. Current Tenant Population

Please describe your current tenant population for family housing:

Racial composition:

_____ % white _____% Asian

_____ % black _____% American Indian

_____ % hispanic _____% other

_____ number of working families

_____ average income of working families

_____ number of families on AFDC

_____ number of single-headed households